



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,991	05/02/2001	Jason Seung-Min Kim	2100653-991140	5788

7590 04/29/2005

DAVID H. JAFFER  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
2475 HANOVER STREET  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1114

EXAMINER

MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2112

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,991

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Paul R. Myers

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-13, 18-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLellan et al PN 6,636,933 in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551.

As per claims 1, 11, and 21, MacLellan discloses a computer system (100) having a multipath cross bar bus (crossbar 260), comprising: one or more processors (121); one or more resources (memory 220 or disk drives 140) capable of being shared by the one or more processors; and a resource controller (controller 260) and bus that is connected to each resource and to each processor wherein the resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (crossbar switch system interface 160 allows simultaneous accesses to different resources from different processors; parallel transfers or simultaneous accesses; col. 14, lines 35-40, 57 to col. 15, lines 1-5; col. 18, lines 50-53; col. 20, lines 58 to col. 21, lines 1-2). MacLellan also teaches semaphores for signaling however MacLellan is silent as to how the Semaphores are to be

Art Unit: 2112

implemented. Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of the same shared resource.

As per claims 2 and 12, MacLellan discloses memory resources (plural global memory boards 220; col. 12, lines 41+; Fig. 8; col. 14, lines 12+ to col. 15, lines 1+); memory controller (logic sections e.g. 5010; col. 18, lines 42-55);

As per claims 3, 13 and 22, MacLellan discloses crossbar switches 5004 (col. 18, lines 5+); and resource arbitration controller (fig. 10; col. 19, lines 11+; col. 23, lines 26+);

As per claims 8, 18 and 24, MacLellan discloses a plurality of peripheral resources (plural disks drives 140); and peripheral controller (switch controller 260) wherein the controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (crossbar switch system interface 160 allows simultaneous accesses to different resources from different processors; parallel transfers or simultaneous transfers; col. 14, lines 35-40, 57 et seq. to col. 15, lines 1-5; col. 18, lines 50-53; col. 20, lines 58 et seq. to col. 21, lines 1-2).

As per claims 9, 19 and 25, MacLellan discloses crossbar switches 5004 (col. 18, lines 5+); and resource arbitration controller (fig. 10; col. 19, lines 11+; col. 23, lines 26+).

Art Unit: 2112

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLellan et al PN 6,636,933 in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Official Notice as evidenced by Dhuey et al PN 5,805,030.

As per claim 27, MacLellan discloses a computer system (100; fig. 1) comprising: a first processor (121<sub>1</sub>); a second processor (121<sub>2</sub>); a multipath memory controller (controller 260) having a first bus that is capable of connecting the first processor to a set of memory resources and a second bus that is capable of connecting the second processor to the same set of memory resources wherein the first and second processors are capable of simultaneously accessing different memory resources (crossbar switch system interface 160 allows simultaneous accesses to different resources from different processors; parallel transfers or simultaneous transfers; col. 14, lines 35-40, 57 et seq. to col. 15, lines 1-5; col. 18, lines 50-53; col. 20, lines 58 et seq. to col. 21, lines 1-2); a multipath peripheral controller (controller 260) having a first bus that is capable of connecting the first processor to a set of peripheral resources (disk drives) and a second bus that is capable of connecting the second processor to the same set of peripheral resources (disk drives) wherein the first and second processors are capable of simultaneously accessing different peripheral resources (crossbar switch system interface 160 allows simultaneous accesses to different resources from different processors; parallel transfers or simultaneous transfers; col. 14, lines 35-40, 57 et seq. to col. 15, lines 1-5; col. 18, lines 50-53; col. 20, lines 58 et seq. to col. 21, lines 1-2). Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of

Art Unit: 2112

the same shared resource. MacLellan in view of Holt teaches a single resource controller with semaphores for each resource. Official Notice is taken that to have separate Memory controller and Peripheral controllers is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have separate memory and peripheral controllers because this would have allowed for faster concurrent access processing of different types of resources. See also MPEP 2144.04 V. C.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Srini (USPN 5,053,942) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551.

As per claim 1, Srini discloses a computer system (e.g. Fig. 1) having a multipath cross bar bus (crossbar matrix 20), comprising: one or more processors (12); one or more resources (memory 22) capable of being shared by the one or more processors (12); and a resource controller (crossbar chip 10) and bus (26) that is connected to each resource and to each processor wherein the resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (e.g. col. 8, lines 30-50). Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of the same shared resource.

As per claim 2, Srini discloses memory resources (plural memory modules 22; col. 4, lines 15+); memory controller (arbiter 18 and logic; col. 4, lines 41-51);

Art Unit: 2112

As per claim 3, Srini discloses crossbar switches 20; and resource arbitration controller (arbiter 18; col. 4, lines 41+)

6. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-13, 18-19, 21-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Goodwin et al. (USPN 6,125,429; Goodwin) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551.

As per claims 1, 11 and 24, Goodwin discloses a computer system (e.g. Fig. 1) having a multipath crossbar bus (crossbar 12), comprising: one or more processors (CPU0 to CPU3); one or more resources (memory M0-M3 or I/O 16) capable of being shared by the one or more processors (CPU0-CPU3); and a resource controller (arbiter 14) and bus that is connected to each resource and to each processor wherein the resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (e.g. col. 2, lines 46-52; col. 4, lines 26-36; 49-62). Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of the same shared resource.

As per claims 2, 8, 12, 18 and 25, Goodwin discloses memory or peripheral resources (plural memory modules M0-M3; col. 4, lines 26+; or I/O 16); memory or peripheral controller (arbiter chip 14; col. 4, lines 61+);

As per claims 3, 9, 13 and 19, Goodwin discloses crossbar switches 12; and resource arbitration controller (arbiter 14; col. 4, lines 26+)

As per claim 21, Goodwin discloses an apparatus for controlling the access to one or more memory resources by one or more processors, the controller comprising a memory resource controller (arbitor 14) and bus (crossbar switch) that is connected to each memory resource and to each processor so wherein the memory resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more memory resources (col. 2, lines 45-52; col. 4, lines 26-36; 49-62).

As per claim 22, Goodwin discloses crossbar switches 12; and resource arbitration controller (arbiter 14; col. 4, lines 26+)

7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Goodwin et al. (USPN 6,125,429; Goodwin) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Official Notice as evidenced by Dhuey et al PN 5,805,030

As per claim 27, Goodwin discloses a computer system (10; fig. 1) comprising: a first processor (20); a second processor (22); a multipath memory controller (arbitor 14 and x-bar switch 12) having a first bus that is capable of connecting the first processor to a set of memory resources and a second bus that is capable of connecting the second processor to the same set of memory resources wherein the first and second processors are capable of simultaneously accessing different memory resources (col. 2, lines 45-52; col. 4, lines 26-36; 49-62); a multipath peripheral controller (arbitor 14 and x-bar switch 12) having a first bus that is capable of connecting the first processor to a set of peripheral resources and a second bus that is capable of connecting the second processor to the same set of peripheral resources wherein the first and second processors are capable of simultaneously accessing different peripheral resources (col. 2,



Art Unit: 2112

lines 45-52; col. 4, lines 26-36; 49-62). Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of the same shared resource. Goodwin in view of Holt teaches a single resource controller with semaphores for each resource. Official Notice is taken that to have separate Memory controller and Peripheral controllers is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have separate memory and peripheral controllers because this would have allowed for faster concurrent access processing of different types of resources. See also MPEP 2144.04 V. C.

8. Claims 1-2, 11-12, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Hiller et al. (USPN 5,081,575; Hiller) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551.

As per claims 1, 11 and 24, Hiller discloses a computer system (e.g. Fig. 1) having a multipath crossbar bus (crossbar 6), comprising: one or more processors (PEs); one or more resources (PMEs 8) capable of being shared by the one or more processors (PEs); and a resource controller (control section) and bus (crossbar bus) that is connected to each resource and to each processor wherein the resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (e.g. col. 6, lines 55-57). Holt et al teaches each resource of a plurality of shared resources has a semaphore which controls access to the shared resource (Column 2 lines 59-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a semaphore for the

Art Unit: 2112

respective resources because this would have prevented multiple concurrent accesses of the same shared resource.

As per claims 2 and 12, Hiller discloses memory (PMEMs 8); memory controller (control section; col. 6, lines 55 et seq).

As per claim 21, Hiller discloses an apparatus for controlling the access to one or more memory resources (PMEMs) by one or more processors (PEs), the controller comprising a memory resource controller (control section; col. 6, lines 55 et seq) and bus (crossbar switch) that is connected to each memory resource and to each processor so wherein the memory resource controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more memory resources (col. 6, lines 55-57).

9. Claims 3-4, 13-14, 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Hiller et al. (USPN 5,081,575; Hiller) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Goodwin et al. (USPN 6,125,429; Goodwin).

As per claims 3, 13, 23 and 25; Hiller discloses crossbar switch 6. However, Hiller does not teach an arbitration controller. Goodwin teaches that it is known to use a resource arbitration controller to resolve contentions or collisions in a computer system using a crossbar switch (col. 2, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hiller and Goodwin as taught by Goodwin to include a resource arbitration controller in a crossbar switch type system such as that of Hiller to resolve the collisions and contentions particularly in bus systems such as that of Hiller with large numbers of data users (PEs) and resources (PMEMs) connected to them (col. 2, lines 55-67).

Art Unit: 2112

As per claims 4, 14, 23 and 26, Hiller teaches that the crossbar switch comprises multiplexer (col. 6, lines 57-64).

10. Claims 4-7, 10, 14-17, 20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable MacLellan et al (USPN 6,636,933; MacLellan) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Official Notice as evidenced by Hiller et al. (USPN 5,081,575; Hiller).

As per claims 4, 7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 23, and 26, MacLellan teaches all the limitations of the claimed invention including crossbar switch. However, MacLellan is silent as to the switch comprise multiplexer. Official Notice is taken that crossbar switch comprise a multiplexer is notoriously well known in the crossbar switch art at the time the invention was made such as evidenced by Hiller in that multiplexer is utilized in crossbar switch do perform actual switching of signal paths (bus) to connect pairs of processors and resources.

As per claims 5 and 15, MacLellan discloses a plurality of peripheral resources (plural disks drives 140); and peripheral controller (switch controller 260) wherein the controller is capable of permitting each processor to simultaneously access a different resource from the one or more resources (crossbar switch system interface 160 allows simultaneous accesses to different resources from different processors; parallel transfers or simultaneous transfers; col. 14, lines 35-40, 57 et seq. to col. 15, lines 1-5; col. 18, lines 50-53; col. 20, lines 58 et seq. to col. 21, lines 1-2).

As per claims 6 and 16, MacLellan discloses crossbar switches 5004 (col. 18, lines 5+); and resource arbitration controller (fig. 10; col. 19, lines 11+; col. 23, lines 26+);

11. Claims 4-7, 10, 14-17, 20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin et al. (USPN 6,125,429; Goodwin) in view of Holt et al PN 5,394,551 as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Official Notice as evidenced by Hiller et al. (USPN 5,081,575; Hiller).

As per claims 4, 7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 23, and 26, Goodwin teaches all the limitations of the claimed invention including crossbar switch. However, Goodwin is silent as to the switch comprise multiplexer. Official Notice is taken that crossbar switch comprise a multiplexer is notoriously well known in the crossbar switch art at the time the invention was made such as evidenced by Hiller in that multiplexer is utilized in crossbar switch do perform actual switching of signal paths (bus) to connect pairs of processors and resources.

As per claims 5 and 15, Goodwin discloses memory or peripheral resources (plural memory modules M0-M3; col. 4, lines 26+; or I/O 16); memory or peripheral controller (arbiter chip 14; col. 4, lines 61+);

As per claims 6 and 16, Goodwin discloses crossbar switches 12; and resource arbitration controller (arbiter 14; col. 4, lines 26+).

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2112

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 571 272 3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571 272 3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRM  
April 28, 2005



**PAUL R. MYERS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**